



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/741,512	12/19/2003	Anil Kumar Chebolu	BS030708	6302
38516	7590	08/05/2008		
SCOTT P. ZIMMERMAN, PLLC				
PO BOX 3822				
CARY, NC 27519				
EXAMINER				
LE, CANH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2139				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/05/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/741,512

**Applicant(s)**

CHEBOLU ET AL.

**Examiner**

CANH LE

**Art Unit**

2139

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/02/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-29, 31-50 and 52-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-29, 31-50 and 52-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/888)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on 05/02/2008.

Claims 9-10, 30, and 51 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 22, and 43 have been amended.

Claims 1-8, 11-29, 31-50, and 52-63 have been examined and are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's amendment, filed 05/02/2008, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 1-8, 11-21, 22-29, and 31-42 have been fully considered and they are not persuasive. The newly amended claims 1 and 22 with means-plus-function do not overcome 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection.

The language in claim 1 raises an issue because the claim is directed merely to software modules (i.e. a control unit, a reporting unit to collect information) and means-plus-function. The system for controlling computer access in claim 1 does not have physical hardware components. There is no actual physical of component for a control unit and a report unit of the system. There are GUIs setting specified by an administrator and collecting information from a user that are not tied to an article of manufacture which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basic of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

A paragraph [0039] of the specification recites as the following:

*“[0039] The access control unit 155 of one embodiment can be implemented in software, firmware, hardware, or a combination thereof. Preferably, the access control unit 155 is implemented in software, as an executable program, and is executed by a special or general-purpose digital computer 106, such as a personal computer, workstation, minicomputer, or mainframe computer. In various embodiments, the access control unit 155, as software, is downloaded from the Internet by the general-purpose computer 106 and subsequently installed on the general-purpose computer 106. In some other embodiments, the access control unit 155, is provided via computer disks, computer cards, or other file-storage devices, or is pre-installed on the general-purpose computer 106.”*

The access control unit 155 of one embodiment can be implemented in software, firmware, hardware, or a combination thereof.

The claim language does not specify to implement in hardware. Therefore, it can be implemented in software. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 should be rewritten to cover hardware only.

Regard to claim 22, please see the same argument as described in claim 1 above. Claim 22 should be rewritten to cover hardware only.

Claims 2-8 and 11-21 are rejected due to virtual dependency of claim 1.

Claims 23-29 and 31-42 are rejected due to virtual dependency of claim 22.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 1-8, 11-21, 22-29, and 31-42 are maintained.

Applicant's arguments, filed 05/02/2008, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 22-29 and 31-42 have been fully considered and they are not as persuasive.

The Applicant argues that there is a support for means-plus-function as the following:

- a) "*specifying setting*" in a paragraph [0007] .
- b) "*collecting information*" and "*compiling information*" in a paragraph [0006].

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant as the following reasons:

**Per a)** The paragraph [0007] of the specification mentions a phrase "*specifying setting*" in the summary. What is the structure for "*specifying setting*" in the specification? The Examiner was unable to find any information or data on how to implement "*specifying setting*" in the specification.

**Per b)** The paragraph [0006] of the specification mentions a phrase "*collecting information*" and "*compiling information*" in the summary. What is the structure for "*collecting information*" and "*compiling information*" in the specification? The Examiner was unable to find any information or data on how to implement "*collecting information*" and "*compiling information*" in the specification.

Claims 23-29 and 31-42 are rejected due to virtual dependency of claim 22. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph of claims 22-29 and 31-42 are maintained.

The Examiner kindly requests the Applicant to point out with specificity (i.e. column and line) in the specification where the structure is described supporting the means-plus-function limitations (**emphasis added**).

***Response to Amendment***

The applicant's amendment filed 05/02/2008 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Therefore, applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 11-29, 31-50, and 52-63 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

**Claims 1-8, 11-21, 22-29, and 31-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject mater.

**As per claims 1-8 and 11-21:**

The language in claim 1 raises an issue because the claim is directed merely to software modules (i.e. a control unit, a reporting unit to collect information) and means-plus-function. The system for controlling computer access in claim 1 does not have physical hardware components. There is no actual physical of component for a control unit and a report unit of the system. There are GUIs setting specified by an administrator and collecting information from a user that are not tied to an article of manufacture which would result in a practical application producing a

concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basic of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

A paragraph [0039] of the specification recites as the following:

*“[0039] The access control unit 155 of one embodiment can be implemented in software, firmware, hardware, or a combination thereof. Preferably, the access control unit 155 is implemented in software, as an executable program, and is executed by a special or general-purpose digital computer 106, such as a personal computer, workstation, minicomputer, or mainframe computer. In various embodiments, the access control unit 155, as software, is downloaded from the Internet by the general-purpose computer 106 and subsequently installed on the general-purpose computer 106. In some other embodiments, the access control unit 155, is provided via computer disks, computer cards, or other file-storage devices, or is pre-installed on the general-purpose computer 106.”*

The access control unit 155 of one embodiment can be implemented in software, firmware, hardware, or a combination therefore.

The claim language does not specify to implement in hardware. Therefore, it can be implemented in software. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 should be rewritten to cover hardware only.

Claims 2-8 and 11-21 are rejected due to virtual dependency of claim 1.

**As per claims 22-29 and 31-42:**

The language in claim 22 raises an issue because the claim is directed merely to software modules (i.e. specifying settings...; controlling access...; collecting information ...; compiling information) and means-plus-function that are not tied to an article of manufacture which would

Art Unit: 2139

result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basic of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101 (Please, See the same argument as described in claim 1 above; paragraph [0039] of the specification).

The claim language does not specify to implement in hardware. Therefore, it can be implemented in software. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 22 should be rewritten to cover hardware only.

Claims 23-29 and 31-42 are rejected due to virtual dependency of claim 22.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**Claims 22-29 and 31-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling.

“means for specifying settings..”,

“means for storing a list...”,

“means for collecting information...”,

“means for compiling ...”,

“means for specifying in the report a duration ...”,

“means for specifying, in the report, identification ...”,

“means for specifying in the report the computer applications...”,



Art Unit: 2139

“means for authorizing the respective user access to a ...”,

“means for prohibiting the respective user access ...”,

“means for storing the report of the respective user ...”,

“means for updating the report with new collected ...”,

“means for compiling the additional information ...”, critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). The Examiner was unable to find any information or data on how to implement means-plus-function limitations in the specification.

Claim 22 recites,

“means for specifying settings..”,

“means for storing a list..”,

“means for collecting information...”, and

“means for compiling ...” .

Claim 23 recites:

“means for specifying in the report a duration ...”.

Claim 24 recites:

“means for specifying, in the report, identification ...”.

Claim 25 recites:

“means for specifying in the report the computer applications...”.

Claim 26 recites:

“means for specifying in the report the computer applications...”.

Claim 28 recites:

“means for authorizing the respective user access to a ...”.

Claim 29 recites:

“means for prohibiting the respective user access ...”.

Claim 31 recites:

“means for storing the report of the respective user ...”.

Claim 32 recites:

“means for updating the report with new collected ...”.

Claim 36 recites:

“means for compiling the additional information ...”.

Claim 41 recites:

“means for authorizing the respective user to have access ...”.

Claim 42 recites:

“means for prohibiting the respective user to have access ...”.

Claims 23-29 and 31-42 depend on claim 22. They are rejected with the same reason.

The Examiner kindly requests the Applicant to point out with specificity (i.e. column and line) in the specification where the structure is described supporting the means-plus-function limitations (**emphasis added**).

The Office cautions the Applicant about the addition of a new subject matter to the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-5, 15-19, 22-26, 36-40, 43-47, and 57-61** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Kruglenko** (US 2003/0217287 A1).

**As per claim 1:**

Beilinson teaches a system for controlling computer access, comprising:

(a) a control unit installed on a computer to control access to use of the computer according to settings specified by an administrator for at least one user of the computer [Beilinson: abstract; par. [0004]; lines 9-13; par. [0048]-[0060]; par. [0051], lines 5-8; A parent can use sub-category 288 to set specific times during the day that a child is allowed to use the computer. Also, a administrator can limit an employee's allowable login hours to the hours that the employee regularly works], wherein the administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the setting do not apply [Beilinson: par. [0070]; “fig. 5 is an embodiment of the system 500 of the present invention. Group policy objects 510 which circulate around a local network 512 hold the user authorization settings that have been configured through the

system controls 514 typically through an administrator's computer 516. The local network 512 needed to support the invention could be a traditional LAN or WAN. However, it could also be any communications link between two or more computers. So, to be part of the local network 512, a computer needs to be able to communicate with at least one other computer in the local network 512 and needs to be identified as part of the local network 512 ...”];

(b) means for storing a list of restricted computer application [Beilinson: par. [0007]; computer functions include executing software application such as word processors or games; par. [0008]; fig. 2 par. [0041]; par. [0048-0049]; par. [0054]; a restriction component 214 can be used to restrict specific computer functions 226 (e.g. restricted computer application)];

(d) means for comparing the requested computer application to the list of restricted computer applications [Beilinson: par. [0007]; par. [0054-0055]; “Function name sub-category 234 is used to deny or enable a user access to computer functions”];

(e) when the requested computer application is matched to the list of restricted computer applications, then means for prohibiting opening the window associated with the requested computer application, thus terminating the requested computer application [Beilinson: par. [0007]; par. [0054-0055]; “Function name sub-category 234 is used to deny or enable a user access to computer functions”];

(f) a reporting unit installed on the computer to collect information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user, the report being made

accessible to the administrator from a remote database [Beilinson: “Desired data is collected which can be distilled into reports on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. The administrator may apply various filters to the raw data in order to generate reports containing only desired information.... The administrator is further provided with the ability to monitor a user's activity via a read-only view of a user's computer display”; par. [0044]; “The monitoring and auditing component 212 is used to view a user machine by the administrator, to collect user activity data and to generate reports”; par. [0047]; par. [0070]].

Beilinson does not explicitly teach,

(c) means for intercepting a message **for opening a window** associated with a requested computer application, the message intercepted before receipt thereof by an operating system.

However, Kruglendo teaches,

(c) means for intercepting a message **for opening a window** associated with a requested computer application, the message intercepted before receipt thereof by an operating system [Kruglenko: par. [0056]; “A hook is a point in the message-handling mechanism where the message traffic is monitor in order to intercept and process certain message before they reach their target window procedure 306 ... The action taken by the hook procedure varies between types of hooks. The message may be changed, stopped altogether, or simply monitored”];

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Beilinson by including the teaching of

Kruglenko to provide users with a means for preventing an unsophisticated user, such as a small child, from access programs or resources on a computer that may allow the user to cause harm to a computer system by limiting access to the computer's resources to a number of predefined secure programs and resources [Kruglenko: abstract, par. [0001]].

**As per claim 2:**

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes a duration of time the respective user has accessed a particular computer application [Beilinson: abstract; “The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating”; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”].

**As per claim 3:**

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes identification of one or more chronological times in which the respective user has accessed a particular computer application [Beilinson: abstract; “The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating”; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045],

lines 5-9; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”].

**As per claim 4:**

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes the computer applications the respective user is denied access to according to the settings specified by the administrator [Beilinson: abstract; par. [006]; “the implementation of such a system includes restricting a user’s logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications. In addition, the implementation of such a system includes enabling an administrator to temporarily restrict or extend a user’s normally allowed access privileges as well as monitor, audit, and obtain reports of a user’s computer function usage”; par. [009]; par. [0054], lines 7-8; par. [0057], lines 3-4; par. [0065], lines 11-13; “the administrator can thus easily set time of day restrictions or content rating restrictions, for example, and can also specify which reports, if any are desired”; par. [0063], lines 14-15; “a system could be denied until the day after the child’s math final”].

**As per claim 5:**

Beilinson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes the computer applications to which the respective user is granted access [Beilinson: abstract; par. [006]; par.

[009]; par. [0045]; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”; par. [0059], lines 5-6; a child’s daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent; par. [0065]].

**As per claim 15:**

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the reporting unit further collects additional information on which services of a designated computer application the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the additional information being compiled in a report regarding the respective user [Beilinson: par. [0010], “Desired data is collected which can be distilled into reports on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. The administrator may apply various filters to the raw data in order to generate reports containing only desired information.... The administrator is further provided with the ability to monitor a user’s activity via a read-only view of a user’s computer display”; par. [0044]; “The monitoring and auditing component 212 is used to view a user machine by the administrator, to collect user activity data and to generate reports”; par. [0047]; par. [0059], lines 5-6; “ a child’s daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent”; an additional information can be a child’s daily access to computer games].



**As per claim 16:**

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report further includes a duration of time the respective user has accessed a particular service of the designated computer application [Beilinson: abstract; “The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating”; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”].

**As per claim 17:**

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report further identification of one or more chronological times in which the respective user has accessed the particular service of the designated computer application [Beilinson: abstract; “The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating”; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”].

**As per claim 18:**

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report includes the services the respective user is denied access to according to the settings specified by the administrator [Beilinson: abstract; par. [006]; “the implementation of such a system includes restricting a user’s logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications. In addition, the implementation of such a system includes enabling an administrator to temporarily restrict or extend a user’s normally allowed access privileges as well as monitor, audit, and obtain reports of a user’s computer function usage”; par. [0054], lines 7-8; par. [0057], lines 3-4; par. [0065], lines 11-13; “the administrator can thus easily set time of day restrictions or content rating restrictions, for example, and can also specify which reports, if any are desired”; par. [0063], lines 14-15; “a system could be denied until the day after the child’s math final”].

**As per claim 19:**

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report includes the services the respective user is granted access to according to the settings specified by the administrator [Beilinson: abstract; par. [006]; par. [009]; par. [0045]; “Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated”; par. [0059], lines 5-6; a child’s daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent; par. [0065]].

**As per claims 22-26, 36-40:**

35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, has been invoked regarding claims 22-26 and 36-40. The claims recite “means for” plus a function. The structures corresponding to the functions given within claims 22-26 and 36-40 are being interpreted by the Examiner as given within paragraph [0048] of the instant applications specification.

**Claim 22:**

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 1 with additional limitation (d) means for monitoring messages from a requested computer application that are directed to an operating system [Kruglenko: par. [0056]; "A hook is a point in the message-handling mechanism where the message traffic is monitor in order to intercept and process certain message before they reach their target window procedure 306 ... The action taken by the hook procedure varies between types of hooks. The message may be changed, stopped altogether, or simply monitored"], thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

**Claims 23-26 and 36-40:**

Claims 23-26 and 36-40 are similar to those of claims 2-5 and 15-19 accordingly, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 2-5 and 15-19 above.

**As per claims 43-47, 57-61:**

Claims 43-47 and 57-61 are essentially the same as claims 1-5 and 15-19 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

**Claims 6-8, 11, 20-21, 27-29, 31-32, 41-42, 48-50, 52-53, and 62-63** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Kruglenko** (US 2003/0217287 A1), and further in view of **Mathew et al.** (US 2004/0003071 A1).

**As per claim 6:**

Beilinson and Kruglenko do not explicitly teach the system wherein the report is in the form of a web page.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein the report is in the form of a web page [Mathew: fig. 17; par. [0071]; a history summary report implemented as a Web page using a markup language].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson and Kruglenko by including teaching of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator [Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]].

**As per claim 7:**

Mathew further teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the respective user access to a particular application to which the respective was previously denied access [Mathew: fig. 17, section of Blocked Web sites, third column; an administrator can select “Allow site”; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1612; par. [0078], lines 1-5 and lines 9-12].

**As per claim 8:**

Mathew further teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to prohibit the respective user access to a particular application [Mathew: fig. 17, section of Visited sites, third column; an administrator can select “Block site”; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1614; par. [0079], lines 1-10].

**As per claim 11:**

Beilinson and Kruglenko do not explicitly teach explicitly teach the system wherein the reporting unit updates the report with new collected information after an occurrence of at least one particular computer event.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein the reporting unit updates the report with new collected information after an occurrence of at least one particular computer event [Mathew: fig. 5B; fig. 5C; par. [0052]; “the parental control server 204 receives the request resolution and update the consent database 208 with request resolution”].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson and Kruglenko by including teaching of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator [Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]].

**As per claim 20:**

Beilinson and Kruglenko do not explicitly teach the system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the respective user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously denied access.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the respective user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously denied access [Mathew: fig. 17, section of Blocked Web sites, third column; an administrator can select "Allow site"; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1612; par. [0078], lines 1-5 and lines 9-12].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson and Kruglendo by including the teaching of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator [Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]].

**As per claim 21:**

Beilinson and Kruglenko do not explicitly teach a system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to prohibit the respective user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously granted access.

However, Mathew teaches a system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to prohibit the respective user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously granted access [Mathew: fig. 17, section of Visited sites, third column; an administrator can select “Block site”; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1614; par. [0079], lines 1-10].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson and Kruglendo by including the teaching of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user’s allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator [Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]].

**As per claims 27-29, 31-32, 41-42:**

35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, has been invoked regarding claims 27-29, 31-32 and 41-42. The claims recite “means for” plus a function. The structures are corresponding to the functions given within claims 27-29, 31-32 and 41-42 are being interpreted by the Examiner as given within paragraph [0048] of the instant applications specification.

**Claims 27-29, 32 and 41-42** are similar to those of claims 6-8, 11 and 20-21 accordingly, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 6-8, 11 and 20-21 above.

**Regard to claim 31**, Beilinson, Kruglendo, and Mathew teach subject matter as described in claim 27. Mathew further teaches means for storing the report of the respective user [Mathew: par. [0009]; lines 6-8; par. [0069], line 10; **a summary information is stored**].

**As per claims 48-50, 52-53, 62-63:**

**Claims 48-50, 53 and 62-63** are essentially the same as claim 6-8, 11 and 20-21 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

**Regard to claim 52**, Beilinson, Kruglendo, and Mathew teach subject matter as described in claim 48. Mathew further teaches storing the report of the respective user [par. [0009]; lines 6-8; par. [0069], line 10; **a summary information is stored**].

**Claims 12-13, 33-34, and 54-55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Kruglenko** (US 2003/0217287 A1) and further in view of **Mathew et al.** (US 2004/0003071 A1), and further in view of **Rowland** (US 6,405,318 B1).

**As per claim 12:**

Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew do not explicitly teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging on the computer.



However, Rowland teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging on the computer **[Rowland: Col. 4, lines 30-38; a system monitors logs (record) all logins and logouts for the target host 21].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew by including the teaching of Rowland because it would be able to detect intrusion as they are occurring or soon after in real-time system **[Rowland, fig. 17, par. [0068], lines 1-3].**

**As per claim 13:**

Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew do not explicitly teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging off the computer.

However, Rowland teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging off the computer **[Rowland: Col. 4, lines 30-38; a system monitors logs (record) all logins and logouts for the target host 21].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew by including the teaching of Rowland because it would be able to detect intrusion as they are occurring or soon after in real-time system **[Rowland, fig. 17, par. [0068], lines 1-3].**

**As per claims 33-34:**

35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, has been invoked regarding claims 33-34. The claims recite “means for” plus a function. The structures are corresponding to the functions given within claims 33-34 are being interpreted by the Examiner as given within paragraph [0048] of the instant applications specification.

Claims 33-34 are similar to those of claims 12-13 accordingly, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 12-13 above.

**As per claims 54-55:**

Claims 54-55 are essentially the same as claim 12-13 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

**Claims 14, 35, and 56** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson** et al. (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Kruglenko** (US 2003/0217287 A1) further in view of **Mathew** et al. (US 2004/0003071 A1), and further in view of **Terry** (US 2002/0026605 A1).

**As per claim 14:**

Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew do not explicitly teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the start up of the computer.

However, Terry teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the start up of the computer [Terry: par. [0051], lines 1-3; “tracking of all internal machine configuration profiles (start-up) in a computer unit 105 having the client application 110”].

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Mathew by including the teaching of Terry because it would provide the ability to report in a real-time environment to the monitor station and the ability to record and analyze a “penetration pattern” of unknown program [Terry, par. [0016] and par. [0017]].

**As per claim 35:**

35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, has been invoked regarding claim 35. The claims recite “means for” plus a function. The structures are corresponding to the functions given within claim 35 are being interpreted by the Examiner as given within paragraph [0048] of the instant applications specification.

Claim 35 is similar to those of claim 14, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 14 above.

**As per claim 56:**

Claim 56 is essentially the same as claim 14 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 20020091870 A1 to MADL, MICHAEL THOMAS et al.;

US 20030191865 A1 to De Armas, Mario E. et al.;

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Canh Le whose telephone number is 571-270-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kincaid Kristine can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Canh Le/

Examiner, Art Unit 2139

July 28, 2008

/Kristine Kincaid/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2139